

ILO-IPEC

**NATIONAL PROGRAMME
FOR THE PREVENTION AND ELIMINATION
OF WORST FORMS OF CHILD LABOUR IN UKRAINE**

An Independent Final Evaluation

**Natalia Astapova
National Consultant
Kyiv, April 2006**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Evaluation of the National Programme for the Prevention and Elimination of Worst Forms of Child Labour was carried out during March-April 2006. The purpose of the evaluation was to identify whether the objectives of the Programme were achieved and assess overall impact of the Programme or progress towards it at different levels, effectiveness of the overall Programme implementation as well as concrete strategies and models of intervention.

ILO-IPEC National Programme for Prevention and Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Ukraine 2001-2006 made important contribution to the prevention and elimination of child labour in Ukraine focusing on the worst forms of child labour.

This contribution included changing attitudes towards Child Labour and raising awareness of the WFCL among government officials, practitioners and children targeted by the Programme interventions; inclusion of activities needed to prevent and eliminate WFCL both in public policy agenda and direct work with children on local level (secondary and boarding schools, orphanages, youth centres and other institutions). The Programme contributed to strengthening of institutional framework for prevention and progressive elimination of the WFCL, namely development and implementation of the National Concept and respective Plan of Actions on Prevention and Elimination of the WFCL as well as changes to the Labour Code and Law of Ukraine on Childhood Protection. Capacity of government institutions and practitioners to prevent, identify and withdraw children from WFCL as well as provide quality services were also significantly strengthened within the Programme and will continue benefiting children beyond the Programme lifetime. One of the most important results of the Programme has been withdrawal of children from the WFCL and provision of quality rehabilitation and reintegration services (including return to formal schooling).

Although the Programme's achievements were impressive a number of other important steps need to be made to achieve long-term sustainable results. The Programme's geographic coverage needs to be broadened and some of the practices need to be scaled up to national level; more synergies with overall anti-poverty efforts need to be used; capacity of governmental and non-governmental partner institutions should be further strengthened to implement quality large-scale programming in the area. If the Programme is continued in any format, the possibility of launching Time-Bound Programme should be explored and necessary preparatory steps need to be made in this direction. At this stage Time-Bound Programme is not feasible. Ukrainian society has admitted existence of child labour and its worst forms and associated problems only recently and mostly in the regions covered by the Programme and on the level of socially responsible individuals. Broad support of society, strong, explicit and consistent political commitment as well as support of a wide range of government ministries and agencies still need to be ensured. As was mentioned above, institutional capacity also needs to be further strengthened. This applies first of all to building human resources capacity both in substantive (child labour related knowledge and methodology) and technical (programme management and resource mobilization) areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	4
METHODOLOGY	5
PERFORMANCE AND ACHIEVEMENTS	7
IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS	14
SUSTAINABILITY	18
RELEVANCE OF STRATEGY	22
PROGRAMME DESIGN	24
CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED	27
ANNEXES	29

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AP	Action Programme
CL	Child Labour
CLU	Child Labour Unit
CLMS	Child Labour Monitoring System
CP	Country Programme
DAP	Direct Action Programme
IA	Implementing Agency
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour, ILO
LAC	Local Action Committee
MES	Ministry of Education and Science
MLSP	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NSC	National Steering Committee
SIMPOC	Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour, ILO
SPIF	Strategic Programme Impact Framework
TBP	Time-Bound Programme
TOR	Terms of Reference
USDOL	United States Department of Labour
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour

I. METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of the National Programme for the Prevention and Elimination of Worst Forms of Child Labour (“the Programme”) was carried out during March-April 2006. The purpose of the evaluation was to identify whether the objectives of the Programme were achieved and assess overall impact of the Programme or progress towards it at different levels, and effectiveness of the overall Programme implementation as well as concrete strategies and models of intervention.

The scope of the evaluation covered all Programme activities including Action Programmes. Present evaluation focused primarily on the Country Programme, however linkages with the Anti-trafficking component were also examined where found appropriate. The evaluation was carried out according to the Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation of the Programme (Annex 5).

Evaluation methodology included: documentation analysis; field visits; semi-structured and unstructured individual and group interviews; observation; and focus groups (detailed information on documents reviewed and respondents is provided in Annexes 1, 2, and 3). Evaluation findings and conclusions presented in the report were based on analysis of respective Programme documents, quantitative and qualitative information collected in the course of Programme implementation, and information provided by more than 93 respondents - at least 31 specialists, 15 children-beneficiaries, 31 government officials (of both central and local government agencies), 10 NGO representatives, 4 ILO representatives, 2 Trade Unions representatives and others.

Overall, the methodology was adequate and valid to the purposes and tasks of evaluation. However, there were several methodological limitations that should be mentioned. Several evaluation meetings were attended by large number of people (at some meetings the delegation included as many as 9 people). This caused some complications in communication and could significantly affect reliability of information provided by respondents. The situation was complicated by presence of representatives of the funding agency at some of the meetings. From methodological point of view involvement of representatives of donor and implementing agencies in evaluation meetings is highly undesirable since it may negatively affect reliability of data collected during the meetings. However, the evaluation team tried to address the issue and mitigate any potential risks to the quality of data by checking them in less public settings with larger number of partners.

Another methodological limitation is status of Action Programmes, which are in the focus of the Country Programme final evaluation and are not completed yet. For these APs final results are not available. Further in the report they are analysed from the point of view of implementation, design, relevance and potential for sustainability as can be judged at present stage rather than their final results.

One of the helpful methodological tools was National Consultation Workshop that took place on April 3, 2006. It not only allowed checking preliminary observations of the evaluation team with the majority of stakeholders, but was also used for further data collection (more information on the workshop’s results and list of people in attendance is provided in the Annexes 3 and 4).

Present report is structured according to main evaluation questions suggested by the TOR and information is organized around the suggested aspects to be addressed as described in the document. Main findings and recommendations are organised and presented in the context of the Programme's performance and achievements; implementation process; potential for sustainability; relevance of strategy; and overall Programme design. The information in the report is presented in analytical rather than descriptive way, although brief description of concrete Programme activities and interventions is also provided where necessary.

II. PERFORMANCE AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Introduction

Ukraine Country Programme has been implemented from March 2001¹ through the end of September 2006 (project extensions). Programme implementation had 4 major components (detailed list of activities is provided in the Annex 5):

- research of different issues related to the WFCL in Ukraine
- information and education activities aimed at raising awareness of the problems related to the WFCL among different stakeholders on all levels
- capacity building activities targeting different stakeholders (primarily government agencies and service providers)
- direct actions aimed at prevention of the WFCL as well as identification, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of the children involved in WFCL.

The Programme was active on both central and local levels as well as involved variety of stakeholders in activities and decision making (central and local government agencies, NGOs and Trade Unions, schools, orphanages, youth centres and individual practitioners (psychologists, social pedagogues, specialists of government agencies) as well as children-beneficiaries.

Geographically, the Programme initially concentrated on Kyiv, Vynnytsya, Kherson and Donetsk oblasts² (Country Programme March/July 2001 – June 2003) and then was concentrated in Kherson and Donetsk oblasts (CP July 2004 – September 2006). The decision to focus the Programme implementation on the two oblasts as a way to better target interventions resulted from May 2004 SPIF workshop.

Outputs

The Programme under review had six immediate objectives. The objectives and progress towards them are listed and analysed below.

Immediate Objective 1: After three months the institutional framework for the Programme will be put in place and at the end of the programme monitoring mechanisms will be established and tracking system set up and operational

The Programme was launched with delay. Officially, it started in March 2001, whereas actual CP implementation started in July 2001. Institutional framework for the Programme implementation was set up in September 2001. However, after it became operational, internal monitoring mechanisms were established and the monitoring system is now tracking the Programme implementation and IA's performance. Development of external monitoring system (CLMS) has not been finalised yet. However, number of monitoring visits made to date demonstrates that the respective targets set in the Project Monitoring Plan are being achieved. Institutional framework and coordination mechanism (NSC, LACs, and CLU) were formally established, however some of them (CLU and NSC) are not yet functioning to their full capacity and others (LACs) are reasonably effective but experience coordination

¹ In fact the Programme started in July 2001.

² "Oblast" is large administrative-territorial unit in Ukraine consisting of smaller units ("raion").

problems. It can be concluded that formally the objective was achieved but the quality and level of delivery of different outputs is different.

Immediate Objective 2: At the end of the Programme, capacity of government of Ukraine will be strengthened to enforce CL policies by means of (i) developing a National Policy and Plan of Action based on the National Report on CL drafted by the Ukrainian Institute of Social Research in June 2000; (ii) reviewing the national legislation and making suggestions to harmonise the legal framework for CL with international standards; (iii) strengthening the capacity of training institutions.

The objective was almost accomplished by the Programme. National Concept and Plan of Actions to Prevent and Combat WFCL in Ukraine were not only approved by the Cabinet of Ministers in 2003 but also many steps were taken by government of Ukraine towards their implementation. Some national legislative documents were also amended with the input from the Programme (for example, amendment on WFCL introduced to the new Labour Code and Article 21 of the Law on Protection of Childhood). Capacity of the training institutions has been strengthened given the number of new central and local government as well as community activities and initiatives launched aimed at addressing the problem of child labour.

Immediate Objective 3: At the end of the Programme, parents and community leaders will have greater awareness and better understanding of CL issues through campaigns and a range of pilot projects (mainly in the areas identified and selected in the course of Programme implementation)

Based on quantitative data on indicators and qualitative information provided by the respondents the objective was largely accomplished. On average, actual Programme outputs delivered in this area meet the targeted ones. Overall number of media reports devoted to child labour issues and estimated number of people covered by awareness raising events are impressive given the Programme's limited geographic scope. Analysis of information provided by the respondents make it possible to conclude that the Programme significantly raised awareness of the CL issues particularly those related to WFCL. The level of awareness among all segments of population in the target regions is much higher today than it was in 2001.

Immediate Objective 4: At the end of the project, direct action programmes aimed at prevention, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of child labourers from specific sectors into society will have been implemented, documented and lessons learnt will be shared with the Government of Ukraine and ILO partners.

The Objective has not been fully accomplished yet since DAPs are under implementation. However, 36 children were already withdrawn from CL within one of the DAPs. During the lifetime of the Programme in total 1236 children (534 boys and 702 girls) were withdrawn from exploitative work through the provision of "educational services or training opportunities".

Immediate Objective 5: At the end of the project, knowledge base of the national stakeholders on child labour issues will have been improved through the research on the use of child labour in the informal economy. The research will be carried out in at least six sectors and supervised by an Editing Board, recruited based on recommendation of the National Steering Committee.

The Objective has not been fully accomplished yet since the respective research was not finalised. Final research results are expected in June 2006. However, 563 children (259 girls and 304 boys) working in 6 sectors (agriculture, small street-based trade/work, entertainment, commercial sexual exploitation, other illicit activities) were interviewed by professional psychologists and provided with individual counselling.

Immediate Objective 6: At the end of the Programme, an integrated model of Child Labour Monitoring System has been tested in two different oblasts and is presented for replication to the Government, to social partners and relevant stakeholders.

The Objective was not fully accomplished yet since the respective AP implementation has recently begun. However, some results have been already achieved: 36 children out of 50 planned for the reporting period 8 were withdrawn from CL (identified and referred through LACs).

Impact

Development objective: the Programme will contribute to the prevention and progressive elimination of the CL in Ukraine, focusing on the worst forms of CL as defined in ILO Convention on the Worst Forms of CL (No.182).

The Programme's contribution to the prevention and progressive elimination of the CL in Ukraine, focusing on its worst forms is described below.

One of the major contributions of the Programme was changing attitudes towards Child Labour and raising awareness of the WFCL among government officials, practitioners and children targeted by the Programme interventions and inclusion of the activities needed to prevent and eliminate WFCL both in public policy agenda and direct work with children on local level (secondary and boarding schools, orphanages, youth centres and other institutions)

Development and implementation of the National Concept and respective Plan of Actions on Prevention and Elimination of the WFCL as well as changes introduced to the Labour Code and Law of Ukraine on Childhood Protection may also be considered impact-level structural changes.

Strengthened capacity of government institutions and practitioners to prevent or withdraw children from WFCL as well as provide quality services are also important contributions of the Programme that will continue benefiting children beyond the Programme lifetime.

Withdrawal of children from the WFCL and provision of quality rehabilitation and reintegration services (including return to formal schooling) is one of the most important Programme outcomes.

Programme Highlights

Approach

The problem of the WFCL is very complex. Because of its numerous causes and consequences it needs to be resolved on all levels with involvement of different agencies and practitioners. That is why multi-sector, inter-agency and interdisciplinary approach of the

Programme is one of its major strengths. Close cooperation between government agencies (central and local government bodies) and NGOs (implementing NGOs and Trade Unions) should be particularly mentioned. The Programme has been one of the few successful examples of development programmes that are not only supported by government, but also involve government agencies as implementers (for example, State Labour Inspection on both central and local level, and Training Institute of the State Employment Centre³). This was very important both for capacity building of respective government agencies and ensuring local ownership and sustainability of the Programme interventions and their results.

Cooperation

Within the Programme mechanisms for coordination of activities related to elimination of the WFCL were developed and enacted both on central (National Steering Committee) and local (Local Action Committees) level. On local level algorithm of identification, withdrawal, referral, rehabilitation and reintegration of children from the WFCL was also developed and piloted. All agencies involved in the process surveyed (Service for Minors Affairs, Department for Internal Affairs, Labour Inspection, Criminal Militia for Minors Affairs, Department of Education) had uniform understanding of their role in the process and characterise the mechanism as potentially necessary, effective, and workable.

Capacity building

Capacity building component of the Programme has been successful both on local and central level. On local level practitioners mentioned high quality of trainings provided to psychologists, social pedagogues, and specialists of Services for Minors Affairs. They particularly mentioned high quality of methodological and information materials provided during the trainings. Those of them who already had an opportunity to practice new techniques noted that the methodology of working with children taught during the trainings was valid and workable, and its use helped provide quality services to children and produce results. Many of them also mentioned different methodological approaches to counselling of boys and girls and found gender aspects of the trainings useful for their practice.

Children's feedback

Children who received services within the Programme (psychological or professional counselling, trainings organised by their peers in youth centres) mentioned that access to such services was important to them as well as reflected positively on quality of the services. When asked why these services were important, children provided different explanations.

For example, 18-year old girl, provided with psychological counselling in "Woman To Woman" Centre in Donetsk explained that "Centres like this help prevent children from finding themselves abroad in difficult situations... and help children get back to life".

Peer-to-peer training recipients, boys of 15 and 13 years old who used to work as loaders earning 10-15 UAH (2-3\$) per day, mentioned that they have learned much about child labour during the trainings provided by their peers in Novaya Kahovka Youth Centre, Kherson Oblast. Particularly, they learned that child labour was not necessary and if child did not want to work he/she had a right not to. They also mentioned that the youth centre provided opportunity to make friends and socialise with their peers.

³ Due to difference in translation State Employment Centres are often referred to as "Public Employment Services" in different Programme documents.

A boy who was previously involved in agricultural work mentioned that the trainings provided by youth centre in Novaya Kahovka indicated that “somebody takes care of us [children]” and this feeling was important to him. He also mentioned that child labour was a regular topic for discussion in the centre what differed from the country at large where the topic was never discussed at all.

Research

Efforts aimed at in-depth research of WFCL problem were also undertaken within the Programme. These efforts contributed a lot to the assessment of real situation with WFCL in Ukraine and helped better target the Programme’s interventions. Some of the efforts are planned to become systematic. This applies first of all to the Child Labour Monitoring System that would become a mechanism for identification of children involved in WFCL, accumulation of data on them, and referring them to the profile institutions for withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration as appropriate. Not only formal but also informal sector was included in the sphere of coverage. Since the majority of cases of children involvement in WFCL are in informal sector this approach is well grounded and justified.

Building on existing structures and capacities

For its implementation the Programme has been relying on existing institutional structures both vertically and horizontally. Almost all Programme interventions were based on existing governmental and nongovernmental organizations and their capacities and only few new structures were established within the Programme (such as, Child Labour Unit within the Labour Inspection, National Steering Committee, and Local Action Committees).

Areas that may be improved

Coordination

As mentioned above many institutions were involved in Programme implementation. This caused some difficulties in coordination and communication. As some of the Programme partners noted necessary information was not always provided by partner agencies as well as activities of partner agencies were sometimes poorly coordinated.

Functioning of new structures

Several structures established within the Programme are not fully functional at the moment. This primarily applies to Child Labour Unit that still is not working at its full capacity. CLU was planned to become National Steering Committee secretariat and CLMS focal point. CLU was established and positioned as a structure of Labour Inspection and is located on Labour Inspection Head Office’s premises. It was established in March 2005 when the Head of the Unit was recruited. However, the IPEC-Ukraine Programme management was not satisfied with his performance. Also, according to the opinion of stakeholders involved in the CLMS Programme CLU to date was much more successful as NSC secretariat than as CLMS focal point.

CLMS

CLMS is now being launched and if functional would become a powerful tool for collection, accumulation and further use of information on child labourers in both formal and informal sectors. Although results of its implementation are not yet available, several partners mentioned the need to further formalise the CLMS including giving official status to data collection sheets used in the system.

Data collection and accumulation

Several stakeholders mentioned a need to create uniform database containing not only information on child labour but also other kinds of information related to children and ensure access to the database for all the agencies concerned. Some of the partners pointed out that for the time being CLMS may be enough, but strategically, there should be a uniform data collection system and in the future the need for uniform database will become more and more pressing. Besides supplying information necessary to the work of government and non-governmental agencies concerned, the uniform database would also become powerful inter-agency coordination mechanism ensuring effectiveness and efficiency of interventions.

Work with parents/family

Within the Programme attention has been paid to work with children, service providers (peer educators, psychologists, social pedagogues) and specialists of government agencies involved. Much less attention was paid to work with parents. Working with parents/family is important both in a case when child labour is caused by low family income and when family dysfunction is a primary cause.

Address the cause

Poverty and income inequality are major causes of child labour in Ukraine. However, many practitioners noted that often children involved in CL come from relatively well-off families. In this case children's involvement in CL including its worst forms is usually caused by family dysfunctions. In both cases diagnostic work with family is important. It should start with identification of the root cause for child's involvement in CL to make all subsequent interventions effective.

Work with employers

Another potential area to be closer explored is working with employers. Demand side of CL should be examined to make further interventions in this area more tailored and targeted.

Recommendations:

Some ways to broaden substantive and institutional scope of the Programme's activities in order to make it more effective, efficient, and sustainable are suggested below.

☞ To enhance mainstreaming of CL in the national development agenda and provide information basis for further work on policy level (further strengthening of government policy making capacity) regular policy analysis activities may be implemented within the Programme. Analysis of implementation of Plan of Actions Aimed at Prevention and Elimination of WFCL planned by the Programme may become the first of the series. Other studies would identify policy gaps and legislative collisions, implementation and enforcement problems, government policy making and implementation capacity gaps. Results of the studies could be used both by government (to inform policy making) and the Programme (planning potential capacity building interventions). This activity may also require development of a special assessment tool for regular assessment of national development policies and programmes from child labour perspective.

☞ As indicated above, closer work with employers seems to be necessary. To develop workable strategy for working in this area, demand side of CL should be explored (why CL is used, where it is used, what most common risks and hazards to which children are exposed to are, etc.) to make further interventions in this area more tailored and targeted.

✍ The Programme may consider paying more attention to working with parents/families of children involved/withdrawn from the WFCL with the aim to prevent involvement in or return to the WFCL. In each individual case root cause of involvement in CL should be diagnosed. Absolute and relative poverty are most common root causes of children's involvement in CL and its worst forms. All anti-CL and anti-WFCL programs should be planned and implemented in the context of broader anti-poverty efforts. Until there are poor households with limited prospects for gainful employment and improvement of their socio-economic status CL and WFCL will persist. Both preventive and "curative" components of the Programme could be strengthened by working with parents/families of risk group children or those withdrawn towards their economic empowerment. This assistance would be provided by specialized NGOs using opportunities provided by State Employment Centres and existing SME development support infrastructure. Building on existing partnership between the Programme and State Employment Centres and using existing mechanisms for cooperation would be important to cover not only children per se but also their parents. The Centres would help to find employment/start business or to receive re-training/upgrading of skills with the ultimate goal to improve the family's economic status and reduce the risks for children to involve in/return to WFCL. In case of dysfunctional families individualized psychological and/or social support should be provided by specialists trained within the Programme.

✍ Peer education component to prevention of the WFCL could be reinforced and expanded both geographically and methodologically based on capacity of the Law School clinics network. Many Law School clinics have developed Street Law programmes that are usually taught to secondary schools students. Street Law courses are powerful public legal education tool and often have children rights module. They are taught by Law School students who know methodology of working with children and can convey messages related to children's rights in easily comprehensible and exiting way. Because Law School clinics network is broad geographically and covers all the oblasts of Ukraine and is supported by universities and donor organizations, building upon the network for peer education-based preventive component of the Programme would be effective and efficient way to enlarge geographic coverage without significant additional costs. The Programme might want to look at existing Street Law modules and introduce anti-WFCL component in the training package. Existing capacities of Law School clinics could also be used to enlarge legal services component of the Programme.

✍ The Programme may consider developing a network or coalition of all NGOs working on the problem of Child Labour. The network/coalition would become a powerful instrument to lobby development, adoption and implementation of the necessary anti-CL policy documents and legislation.

III. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Timing

As was mentioned above, there were some delays in launching the Programme. At later stages of the Programme delays were also taking place. Many implementing partners mentioned one to two month delays in the beginning of their respective programs (for reasons connected with ILO administrative practices or summer vacations of the target group) and two to three month delays in receiving the second instalment of funds to finance their programmes (primarily caused by lengthy and complicated ILO reports approval procedure).

Effectiveness of structures established

Another implementation issue is relative inactivity of the National Steering Committee, which at this stage is not effective largely for political reasons. Due to its vulnerability to political risks it experiences frequent membership turnover and its present composition was not yet approved by the Cabinet of Ministers. Some partners who started their projects recently mentioned that they needed NSC but since the commencement of their projects there was no a single meeting of the Committee. (Last time the NSC official meeting took place in 2004).

Although buy-in of central and local government bodies was ensured from the very beginning of the Programme their support and active involvement is more obvious on local level. Local government agencies (namely, Donetsk and Kherson Oblast State Administration) are involved in Programme implementation both in Donetsk and Kherson. Kherson Oblast State Administration issued the Resolution #252 on March 16, 2006 On Coordination of Work Aimed at Elimination of WFCL in which appointed coordinator of the Programme activities in Kherson oblast (Head of Service for Minors Affairs of the Oblast State Administration); identified geographic coverage of the Programme⁴ in the oblast and ordered respective Raion State Administrations develop Local Action Committees to monitor WFCL; discussed composition of the Local Action Committees and endorsed introduction of the CLMS; and supported delivery of CLMS trainings to government officials and NGOs concerned. Although there was no similar official Resolution in Donetsk, LACs activities as well as other Programme components were formalized in different form earlier than in Kherson.

Local Action Committees both in Kherson and Donetsk oblasts were characterised by the majority of the Programme partners as potentially necessary structures that would be contributing to coordination of all activities related to WFCL prevention and elimination including introduction of the CLMS. However, the partners supplied mixed evidence on LACs' present day effectiveness. Some partners noted that at this point LACs are "formal and not effective yet". Others mentioned that they are effective and "if they were not in existence they would need to be established". However, all partners agreed that the idea of LAC is a good one and due to their composition⁵ and access to different organizational resources and powers they would contribute to quality Programme implementation on local level and their potential is very high. To date their functions ranged from purely organizational work

⁴ Henichesk, Hola Prystan, Skadovsk, Chaplynka, Tsyurupynsk, Kalanchak, Bilozerka, Beryslav raions and Kherson, Nova Kahovka, and Kahovka towns.

⁵ Local Action Committee usually includes representatives of the following agencies: Trade Unions and Employers' organizations; Labour Inspection; Employment Centres; Centres for Social Services for Family, Children and Youth; Services for Minors Affairs; Departments of Education; Departments for Family, Youth and Sports; public health agencies; Criminal Militia for Minors Affairs; and NGOs involved in Children social protection.

(coordination of inter-agency cooperation, resolving implementation issues) to making substantive programming decisions (how to use funds aiming at provision of material assistance to children in need). Difference in partners' opinion can be attributed to variations in quality of their performance in different raions.

Objective implementation issues

Programme implementation faced some objective obstacles that created additional challenges and could inhibit the progress on a number of directions. The major implementation issue was high turnover among central and local government officials what introduced complications in ensuring continuity of the Programme efforts. Political risks were partially mitigated by targeting lower-rank officials who are not as vulnerable to turnover for political reasons as higher-ranking ones. However, there were also other issues that were beyond the Programme control, namely:

- Low staffing levels of labour inspection (around 700 labour inspectors to cover the whole territory of Ukraine) and high staff turnover (for example, within the CLMS AP of 15 labour inspectors trained 2 inspectors have already quit their jobs in Donetsk and 1 in Kherson);
- Limited mandate of the Labour Inspection and its inability to conduct integrated inspection of workplaces of child labourers. For example, Labour Inspection lacks power to conduct integrated inspection of the workplace of working children what makes it difficult to adequately assess working conditions and fully utilise special assessment tool. To complete inspection of a workplace inspectors from other agencies (Hygiene and Sanitary Inspection, Ministry of Health structure, and Work Safety Inspection, Ministry of Emergency structure) need to be involved what is difficult both organizationally and technically;
- Establishment of state rehabilitation centres is behind the schedule what also causes difficulties for implementation of the certain Programme components;
- There is no system of juvenile justice in the country and judges lack skills and knowledge in resolving WFCL-related cases and enforcing respective legislation;
- In the regions youth centres do not have adequate organizational capacity and physical infrastructure for quality Programme implementation;
- Identification of children involved in the WFCL is still a challenge and it is difficult to reach them especially in informal sector. At present they are identified by practitioners during their work with children (individual consultations, trainings) or by Services for Minors Affairs or Criminal Militia for Minors Affairs. Although target beneficiaries are reached more or less effectively, identification still seems to have sporadic rather than systematic nature.

There were also several implementation issues of administrative nature mentioned by the Programme implementers, such as:

- Personnel of many Implementing Agencies has limited knowledge of English what complicates and delays preparation, submission, and approval of the reports;
- IAs do not have adequate project design skills to ILO and USDOL standards;

- Complicated and lengthy administrative procedure of documents approval causes delays in implementation;
- Ambitious targets for anti-trafficking Programme component;
- Complicated indicators with no clear guidelines on how to collect and analyse respective data.

Programme Efficiency

The Country Programme financial resources (US\$ 1,127,980 in total on average US\$215,000 per year⁶) have been managed efficiently taking into account the Programme length (5 years to date, 5.5 years in total), geographic scale (official geographic coverage is 6 raions in Donetsk oblast and 6 in Kherson oblast; in reality the scope of the Programme is even larger as demonstrated by the Kherson Oblast State Administration Resolution cited above); and scope of activities both vertically (government agencies concerned and NGOs on both central and local level) and horizontally (practitioners from secondary and boarding schools, youth centres, and orphanages).

The Programme was successful in finding co-funding for some of its projects from other donor agencies. Thus, OSCE provided €18,000 to co-fund life-skills training to children who live in boarding schools and are covered by DAPs in Kherson and Donetsk; UNICEF provided \$15,000 to co-find TOT for Youth Leaders of Ukraine on Improving Understanding of CL issues; USAID-funded Parliamentary Development Programme co-financed (\$865) mini-programme “Awareness Raising for Members of Parliament”; CIDA-funded Canadian Local Initiatives Fund provided \$5,700 to co-finance AP Capacity Building of Labour Inspection for its Participation in CLMS.

Within the Programme SCREAM methodology was adapted to the national context and widely disseminated. It was officially endorsed by the Ministry of Education and Science and recommended for use in institutions for upgrading teachers’ professional qualifications. Also linkages within the Programme (between the Country Programme and Anti-Trafficking component) as well as between the ILO programmes in Ukraine (between IPEC and DECLARATION, IPEC and MIGRANT) were also established and used to their full potential.

Despite all the implementation issues listed above IPEC-Ukraine team managed to achieve good results. However, the results could be greater if the team were not understaffed and had additional person on staff for purely administrative/financial work. In this case the Programme team could devote more time to substantive programming.

Recommendations:

✎ NSC and LACs should be further strengthened. For the NSC, its composition should be officially defined and approved, and meetings regularly conducted. When it starts meeting and implementing its activities, concrete institutional needs will become evident and respective assistance will need to be provided. As for LACs, they should also be strengthened institutionally, but “learning by doing” approach may be more appropriate in this case: becoming more and more involved in practical activities within different APs, they would

⁶ Only funding for Country Programme is being listed here; however, overall effectiveness of the Programme is also to much extent due to synergies with the Anti-Trafficking Programme component financed by the Government of Germany.

improve existing coordination mechanisms or develop new ones that better address their and beneficiaries' needs.

↪ The majority of objective implementation issues discussed above is beyond the Programme's control. However, some of them could be to some extent mitigated. For example, while working with government agencies, the Programme needs to concentrate more on "specialist" level public officials of lower ranks and involve as many of them as appropriate to ensure buy-in and continuity of programming. Identification of child labourers is also among challenges faced by the Programme. Many partners recommend involving district health professionals in LACs as well as monitoring groups. This option is also further discussed in Relevance of Strategy section of the report. High staff turnover in LI is addressed in more detail below in Sustainability section.

↪ On administrative side, report approval procedure period needs to become shorter on all levels in order not to inhibit activities of the IAs. To improve the quality of reports IAs may need some additional training from the Programme. Also, the Programme may want to become more flexible with reporting requirements, particularly with the language of the reports (for example, accept reports in Ukrainian or Russian). Targets and indicators are addressed in more details in Programme Design section.

↪ To make the Programme operations more efficient implementing partners may be encouraged to look for additional financial resources both to co-fund activities within the Programme and obtain institutional support where possible. The latter would significantly reduce IAs' administrative costs to the Programme.

IV. SUSTAINABILITY

In the context of the Programme under review the following dimensions of sustainability can be discussed: sustainability of structural units established within the Programme, Programme activities and their results, and Implementing Agencies. Although these dimensions are closely linked and interrelated they are discussed separately for the purposes of analysis.

Sustainability of structures established within the Programme

As indicated above, National Steering Committee, Child Labour Unit, and Local Action Committees are the structures established by the Programme to date⁷. Of these structures Local Action Committees are operational at the moment. Although contradictory evidence was collected on their present effectiveness, their potential contribution to sustainability of the Programme's efforts was emphasised by many partner agencies interviewed and they may be viewed as a primary institutionalization mechanism on local level. NSC and CLU are not as successful as LACs in this respect. As indicated above NSC is too vulnerable to member turnover whereas CLU still does not work at its full capacity. That is why there is not enough evidence to assess chances for sustainability of these structures. However, there are some elements of the initial design of CLU (such as, its integration into the Labour Inspection; support from the Chief Labour Inspector of Ukraine, intentionally low salary established for the CLU staff in order for it to be maintained by the LI beyond the Programme funding) would contribute to future sustainability of the Unit.

Sustainability of the Programme activities and results

There is high probability that majority of the Programme activities will be sustained beyond its duration due to capacity built and mechanisms established. On Central Government level issues related to the WFCL were not only introduced to the agenda, but also concrete actions were taken towards its implementation. One of the examples is development of the National Concept and Plan of Actions on prevention and elimination of the WFCL, their endorsement by the Cabinet of Ministers in June and October 2003 respectively and their subsequent implementation during 2003-2005 by the government agencies concerned⁸. The new Plan of Actions is currently under development and would take into account experience of the previous Plan of Actions implementation.

Programme activities have high potential for sustainability on the level of State Employment Service both at central and local level due to capacity building efforts undertaken within the Programme. Due to existence of separate capacity building structure affiliated with the State Employment Centre (namely, Training Institute of the State Employment Centre) and overall openness of the structure to substantive and methodological innovations as well as its ability to effectively disseminate them among Employment Centres on oblast and raion level, the Programme's educational and training activities aiming at capacity building of the State Employment Centres are likely to be sustained beyond the Programme support. Rector of the Training Institute mentioned that both substantive and methodological approaches to prevention of WFCL by means of supporting youth employment would be introduced in the Training Institute's curriculum and taught to all categories of the Employment Centres' employees concerned.

⁷ Interagency Task Force on WFCL is now also being established. However, it is too early to assess its role and contribution to sustainability.

⁸ Ministry of Labour and Social Policy; Ministry of Justice; Ministry for Family, Children and Youth Affairs; Ministry of Education and Science; Ministry of Internal Affairs; State Statistics Department, and others.

The situation is somewhat different with Labour Inspection. It does not have separate training institution for Labour Inspectors that would ensure continuity of the Programme's capacity building efforts. Also, staff turnover among Labour Inspectors is very high due to low salaries, large scope of work, and difficult working conditions (in rural areas labour inspectors need to travel long distances at their own expense because the State does not provide funding for travel expenses). In this situation there is a risk that 15 labour inspectors trained by the Programme in CLMS to date may not continue this work in the future and there is no institution beyond the Programme that would continue providing training in the future. There are two possibilities to solve the problem in the short term. First possibility is to have Intermediary Support Organization (for example, Intellectualna Perspectyva NGO that is currently implementing the AP) to provide capacity building services in the future. Another option is to broaden the scope of the CLU's work and empower it to provide not only secretarial and information support, but also training support in the future. The latter option is preferable for sustainability of capacity building efforts. However, in this case much capacity building work needs to be done with the Unit itself first. Technical support to 14 LIs involved in the Programme (purchase of computers; development and instalment of the CLMS software, building respective IT capacity of labour inspectors) would ensure sustainability of the CLMS on infrastructural level.

On local government level there is a support of government agencies both in Donetsk and Kherson oblasts although as it was mentioned above, in Kherson this support is much more formalized due to the respective Resolution. In Donetsk separate elements of the Programme (namely, Local Action Committees) are formalized as well. However, several partners working in Donetsk oblast expressed a need for further formalization of the activities in the Resolution similar to the one issued by the Governor of Kherson oblast.

Sustainability of Non-Governmental Implementing Agencies

Institutional strength and capacity was one of the major selection criteria of the Programme NGO Implementing Agencies. Almost all NGO IAs are well-established organizations with extensive development projects experience in their areas of specialization and good track record of achievement. For many of the IAs activities within the Programme are consistent with their mission and previous programmatic experience. It is necessary to mention also that many organizations have considerable experience in working with donor agencies and have diversified funding base. Many of them mentioned that they couldn't stop their activities because many people knew about their existence and would look for their services under any circumstances. Also, many of them started working in the Programme's substantive area well before they became involved in the Programme and are likely to continue doing so beyond the Programme support.

Local ownership

Overall the Programme was successful in promoting local ownership of its activities in long-term perspective. Support of government agencies and NGO partners was ensured both on central and local level and was expressed in concrete actions on both strategic and operational levels. As indicated above institutional capacity and support infrastructure was also significantly developed and in some cases major concerns relate to objective conditions (such as, high staff turnover in Labour Inspection) rather than lack of long-term commitment. From the analysis of activities of NGO Implementing Agencies it can be concluded that services they provide to target beneficiaries are likely to continue after the Programme finishes due to their long-term commitment and institutional stability. Although some non-governmental IAs are more experienced and established than others, all of them demonstrate commitment to the

cause and willingness to learn. Suggestions provided below may help address some of the potential issues with continuation of the Programme activities beyond its official duration.

Recommendations:

✧ There is no coherent phase-out strategy for the Programme at the moment. Sustainability of interventions is discussed in each separate programmatic document. The Programme may consider development of coherent phase-out strategy. It would ensure division of responsibilities among different stakeholders for different Programme components and actions to be taken to delegate these responsibilities within concrete timeframe; and uniform understanding of potential inter-agency cooperation and coordination mechanisms both during the transition period and beyond. If decision to continue the Programme in either form is made, during the next Programme period phase-out strategy could be implemented and be guiding all the stakeholders through the transition process towards local ownership. At present much interagency cooperation and coordination is performed or facilitated by IPEC-Ukraine in-country team. In the future when this important component is no longer available the work in the area especially during transition period may be complicated. Clear phase-out strategy would prepare all the stakeholders to independent functioning during the transition period and beyond. The strategy would include:

- discussion of division of responsibilities for different Programme components between different stakeholders during and after the transition period;
- identification of the next steps to be taken by IPEC-Ukraine team to build capacity and ensure local ownership (may require organization of some additional trainings on technical components of project cycle management; fundraising for NGOs; strategic planning sessions; transfer of good practices; retreats; and substantive trainings);
- timeline for every activity within the strategy;
- discussion of gradual decrease of funding for implementing agencies (may also be discussed and planned for in the respective programme documents) with introduction of cost-share or co-funding requirements for the main activities.

✧ To ensure sustainability of the Programme activities in Donetsk oblast LACs need to work towards further formalization of the activities there and adoption of a Resolution On Coordination of Work Aimed at Elimination of WFCL similar to the one issued by the Governor of Kherson oblast but taking into account Donetsk oblast specifics⁹.

✧ To mitigate the risks to sustainability of the CLMS on the level of LI associated with the high staff turnover and lack of permanent training institutions, the Programme may consider broadening the future scope of CLU responsibilities to include training component to labour inspectors involved in CLMS. To this end the following steps need to be taken:

- CLU should be made fully operational (current HR issues need to be resolved and depending on the outcome either new CLU staff person should be hired or the capacity of the present staff member strengthened);
- CLU should be empowered to perform not only the functions originally envisioned (secretarial support to NSC and focal point duties on CLMS) but also provide training and consultative support to labour inspectors involved in CLMS. To this end CLU staff should be provided with TOT techniques and be involved in all substantive capacity building

⁹ On the LAC's meeting on March 31, 2006 in Donetsk Oblast State Administration at which the evaluation team was present, the Deputy Governor of Donetsk oblast admitted that the Resolution was necessary and confirmed that it would be issued shortly.

activities (especially those related to CLMS) as well as get some exposure to activities of Labour Inspectors.

V. RELEVANCE OF STRATEGY

The Programme's comprehensive strategy is relevant both to the context of child labour in Ukraine and existing broader development efforts. The Programme's strategy and resulting interventions were developed based on evidence of existing problems and needs provided by different studies of the problem. The Programme should continue working with national and local government agencies, professionals providing direct services to children and their parents, as well as peer educators.

Both the Programme strategy and substantive area fits in government policy priorities aimed at promotion of the children's rights (particularly in the light of the President's Decree on Protection of the Rights of a Child issued in July 2005). Prevention and elimination of WFCL is high on government agenda and it can be to large extent attributed to the Programme's efforts (namely, development of the Concept and Action Plan Aimed at Prevention and Elimination of the WFCL and support in their implementation; introduction of Amendment to the Article 21 "Child and Labour" of the Law on Childhood Protection; mainstreaming of the CLMS into the National Plan of Action to Implement the Rights of the Child 2006-2016).

Within the broader strategy the following successful models of intervention should be highlighted: use of peer education; individualized child-centred rights-based approach; and use of both preventive and "curative" interventions.

Peer education

Use of peer-to-peer education techniques in the Programme's preventive component has been effective strategy to convey messages of the trainings, deliver them in an entertaining child-friendly way, establish rapport with children and make them interested in attending other trainings. Peer educators, children and psychologists reflect positively on the workability and effectiveness of this method for accomplishing the Programme tasks. Important feature of the peer education as used in the Programme is involvement of peer educators who were either withdrawn from the WFCL or were specifically trained in gender sensitive peer-to-peer training methodology. By March 1, 2006, 97 children were covered by peer education activities in Donetsk and Kherson oblasts (51 boys and 46 girls).

Inclusion of children in decision-making

Another important intervention model is inclusion of children in programming decision-making, namely in development of training courses and participatory action planning (based on the children's educational and leisure needs). All interventions aiming at direct help to children are child-centred, individualised, rights-based and gender sensitive.

Use of both preventive and "curative" intervention

The importance of prevention of the WFCL is emphasised within the Programme. At the same time it provides opportunity to receive professional and material help in case of need. There is some evidence that this strategy is effective, workable and has already produced concrete results. Especially, possibility to receive different kinds of services should be emphasised - psychological, legal, material help in case of need (food, clothing, stationary, equivalent up to UAH 300) as well as up to UAH 100 stipend to those involved in vocational education and training.

It is also necessary to mention that the Programme is one of the few development agencies working in Ukraine using such a comprehensive strategy to address the problem and covering

all agencies and stakeholders concerned both horizontally and vertically in its target regions. The majority of other agencies work either on governmental or grass roots level and only few manage to genuinely involve all the stakeholders in the planning and implementation of their development interventions.

Recommendations:

↵ In the future overall comprehensive strategy should be maintained although substantive priorities may change depending on the next steps identified during strategic planning sessions.

↵ Effective intervention models need to be developed for closer work with parents and employers to prevent and address WFCL. Within the framework of the Programme under review these strategic directions were not yet adequately elaborated and full potential of both preventive and “curative” work in this area was not yet utilized.

↵ Since identification of children involved in WFCL is still a challenge, many partners recommend closer work with district child health practitioners who have access to every house with children and know all the details not only about the children but also about their families. The role of this category of practitioners in identification and referral of children or provision of health care and psychological services should not be underestimated. Their involvement may also be a clue to closer work with parents given not only their professional but also personal contact with parents and the role they play in the life of every family with children. Beyond any doubt this opportunity should be further explored and workable intervention models in this area should be developed.

VI. PROGRAMME DESIGN

Overall design

The Programme used comprehensive multi-sectoral, interagency, and multidisciplinary approach to address the problems of WFCL in Ukraine. Overall the Programme design was relevant and addressed major child labour issues in Ukraine. The Programme relied heavily on existing structures and capacities. However, it was also active in changing existing institutional framework (particularly, legislation and national policy documents) and building additional capacity when this was necessary to ensure sustainability of the Programme's interventions and mainstreaming child labour issues in both government policies and activities of local organisations. Characteristic feature of the Programme's approach was involvement of partners from all sectors (public, private and NGO sectors) into its operations on all levels (national, oblast, raion levels). Substantively the Programme included research, awareness raising (both central and local level), development of effective policy planning and implementation instruments on central and local levels as well as development and enactment of identification and reaction mechanisms on local level. On the level of direct actions the Programme activities range from building capacity of practitioners (psychologists, social workers, other specialists) by means of training and consulting, to concrete actions aimed at identification, referral, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of children.

Knowledge base of the Programme at design stage was extensive. To large extent the design was informed by the findings of 1999-2000 SIMPOC Survey in Ukraine conducted by the National Statistical Committee. According to the study 350,000 of children worked in Ukraine primarily in agriculture, trade and services; 96% of working children were involved in physical work out of which 98% in rural areas. The results of the National Survey informed the respective National Report which became the basis of the Programme. After the Programme was launched a number of additional studies were carried out to better research the problem of WFCL in Ukraine and target interventions. The research projects included: Baseline survey on the WFCL in four selected regions of Ukraine (completed in March 2002); study on current Ukrainian legal framework for child labour and recommendations on the national legislation harmonisation with relevant international standards (completed in May 2002); review of the social assistance for trafficked children in Ukraine (completed in June 2004); rapid assessment survey on the use of child labour in six sectors of the informal economy in Ukraine (to be finalised by June 2006).

Data received from both research efforts and consultations with stakeholders on all stages of the Programme allowed identification of major child labour issues in Ukraine, selection of valid workable approaches to address them and targeting interventions.

Overall Programme design (approach, strategy, needs and problems identification, intervention models) seems to be adequate and valid. At the same time some other elements (formulation of outputs and performance measurement) may be improved.

The Programme objectives are sometimes closer to outputs (for example, immediate Objectives 1, 4 and 6 are outputs rather than objectives). Also, Project Monitoring Plan is not user-friendly tool. As project implementers noted, targets are sometimes too ambitious. Also, indicators do not always serve their purpose well. They are:

- numerous (on average 4 indicators per each objective);
- not always measurable and easy to track (for example, indicator 10 – Increased number of people reached by awareness raising events conducted in selected regions; indicator 11 –

number of additional activities (i.e. not planned and funded under the Programme) undertaken by other local administrators and community to combat child labour; indicator 19 - Number of media reports on WFCL following the presentation of the survey findings);

- not always valid. For example, indicator 5 – Number of new groups (employers' and workers' organizations, NGOs local centres, community groups) begin to address child labour issues seem not very indicative of progress towards Immediate Objective 2¹⁰.
- mostly quantitative indicators are used in the PMP. For some objectives use of qualitative indicators would be much more appropriate.
- no guidelines on data collection for each of the indicators were identified by the national consultant in the project documents.

Recommendations

✧ Overall comprehensive approach to Programme design should be maintained in the future. However, implementation mechanism may be changed. To make the Programme more manageable and avoid unnecessary fragmentation and division on Action Programmes, Direct Action Programmes, Mini-Programmes and other efforts, the Programme may unify interventions to the extent possible and have few unified comprehensive programmes implemented by several implementing partners. If partners do not have adequate capacity to implement unified comprehensive programming, respective organizational and programmatic capacity may be built within the Programme.

✧ Implementation mechanisms should become more flexible and overall implementation more demand-driven to respond quickly to new arising needs. To this end small “opportunities fund” or “emergency fund” may be created within the Programme to fund ad hoc initiatives and address problems that need immediate intervention.

✧ The Programme may also consider development of a coherent phase-out strategy discussed in more details in Sustainability section.

✧ Those APs final results of which cannot be evaluated at this point due to their incomplete status, should be reviewed internally after they are complete. This is especially important for CLMS that is planned to be replicated at national level. Special focus of review in this case would be implementation issues and particularly inter-agency coordination issues.

✧ The Programme may also develop more simple and user-friendly PMP for future activities in the area of prevention and elimination of the WFCL to be used not only for external reporting purposes but also to inform management decisions related to programming. To develop such system the following needs to be done:

- assessment of information needs of the Programme staff should take place including analysis of previous experience with data collection and use;
- development of indicators and targets in participatory manner with involvement of a broad range of stakeholders;
- number of indicators needs to be kept to minimum (1-2 indicators per objective);

¹⁰ Immediate Objective 2: At the end of the programme, capacity of Government of Ukraine will be strengthened to enforce CL policies by means of (i) developing a National Policy and Plan of Action based on the National Report on CL drafted by the Ukrainian Institute of Social Research in June 2000; (ii) reviewing the national legislation and make suggestions to harmonize the legal framework for CL with international standards; (iii) strengthening the capacity of training institutions.

- quality of indicators should be improved;
- clear guidelines need to be provided to partners on how data on indicators should be collected;
- targets set should be more realistic;
- not only quantitative but also qualitative indicators should be utilized in the PMP (such as, *quality of the services provided to children, quality of training materials*, etc.) and more qualitative data should be collected (for example, case studies, area studies, etc.)

↳ The Programme may also want to develop electronic knowledge management system that would accumulate information necessary to keep institutional memory and ensure organizational learning.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

ILO-IPEC National Programme for Prevention and Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Ukraine 2001-2006 made important contribution to the prevention and elimination of child labour in Ukraine focusing on the worst forms of child labour.

This contribution included changing attitudes towards Child Labour and raising awareness of the WFCL among government officials, practitioners and children targeted by the Programme interventions; inclusion of activities needed to prevent and eliminate WFCL both in public policy agenda and direct work with children on local level (secondary and boarding schools, orphanages, youth centres and other institutions). The Programme contributed to strengthening of institutional framework for prevention and progressive elimination of the WFCL, namely development and implementation of the National Concept and respective Plan of Actions on Prevention and Elimination of the WFCL as well as changes to the Labour Code and Law of Ukraine on Childhood Protection. Capacity of government institutions and practitioners to prevent, identify and withdraw children from WFCL as well as provide quality services were also significantly strengthened within the Programme and will continue benefiting children beyond the Programme lifetime. Withdrawal of children from the WFCL and provision of concrete help aiming at rehabilitation and reintegration (including return to formal schooling) was one of the most important Programme's outcomes.

Although the Programme's achievements were impressive a number of other important steps need to be made to achieve long-term sustainable results. The Programme's geographic coverage needs to be broadened and some of the practices need to be scaled up to national level; more synergies with overall anti-poverty efforts need to be used; capacity of governmental and non-governmental partner institutions needs to be further strengthened. If the Programme is continued in any format, the possibility of launching Time-Bound Programme needs to be explored and necessary preparatory steps need to be made in this direction. At this time Time-Bound Programme is not feasible. Ukrainian society has admitted the existence of child labour and its worst forms and associated problems only recently and mostly in the regions covered by the Programme and on the level of socially responsible individuals. Broad support of society, strong, explicit and consistent political commitment as well as support of a wide range of government ministries and agencies still need to be ensured. As was mentioned above, institutional capacity also needs to be further strengthened. This applies first of all to building human resources capacity both in substantive (child labour related knowledge and methodology) and technical (programme management capacity and resource mobilization) areas.

Major lessons learned that should be taken into account while designing and implementing other programming in the field of child labour are:

- Political risks to programming connected with frequent changes of government officials and government policies in Ukraine should not be underestimated. Workable mechanisms to mitigate these risks should be developed and incorporated in the Programme design.
- Multi-sector inter-agency nature of the Programme requires more attention to development of functional coordination mechanisms and more time needs to be devoted to development and enactment of these mechanisms. Ensuring sustainable inter-agency

coordination and cooperation on all levels may be one of the biggest challenges especially after the Programme (which is now the most effective coordination mechanism) is over.

- Developing new structures for the Programme purposes is risky from the point of view of their present functionality and potential sustainability and bearing in mind that there is a number of similar structures established by other development agencies. Where possible, development of new structures should be avoided and opportunity to use existing ones needs to be explored. Otherwise, there is a strong chance that new committee, unit, or task force will not function at all or will require much additional resources to make it function.
- From strategic point of view, there should be one unified data collection system on children to ensure informed sound policy making in the area. While developing CLMS and scaling it up to national level the Programme needs to view it in broader policy context, ensure access to it for all the agencies concerned, try to fit it in existing systems and databases, and avoid limiting its use to Labour Inspection. Limited access and use of the system would result in fragmented and ineffective policymaking and coordination problems.

Annex 2: List of The Programme-Related Documents Reviewed

1. AP: A strategy and a package of awareness-raising activities in selected Ukrainian villages designed and implemented aiming at children's development needs, the dangers of early employment and legal provisions on the protection of children.

- Action Programme Summary Outline
- Technical Progress Report
- Final Output Report

2. AP: Strengthening the capacity of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and the State Committee for Family and Youth Affairs to develop the strategy in the field of the child labour, to provide further supervision and analyses of the situation and trends concerning the child labour in Ukraine

- Action Programme Summary Outline
- Technical Progress Report
- Final Output Report

3. DAP: Targeting Worst Forms of Child Labour (Children Involved in Sexual Exploitation, Children Working in Rural Areas, Institutionalized Children at Risk of WFCL) – Pilot Actions Aimed at Prevention, Withdrawal, Rehabilitation and Reintegration of (Ex) Child-Labourers into Society.

- Action Programme Summary Outline

4. AP: Targeting the Involvement of Children in Prostitution in the Regions of Kherson and Kiev: A Pilot Project

- Action Programme Summary Outline
- Workplan 2002-2003
- Technical Progress Report 1
- Technical Progress Report 2
- Technical Progress Report 3
- Final Output Report

5. AP: Targeting rural child labourers in the Vinnitsa Region - A pilot action

- Action Programme Summary Outline
- Workplan 2002-2003
- Technical Progress Report 1
- Technical Progress Report 2
- Technical Progress Report 3
- Final Output Report

6. AP: Targeting Working Street Children in Donetsk and Kiev Regions: Pilot action

- Action Programme Summary Outline
- Workplan 2003
- Technical Progress Report 1
- Technical Progress Report 2
- Technical Progress Report 3
- Final Output Report

7. AP: Targeting Worst Forms of Child Labour (Children Working in Mines, Street Working Children, Institutionalized Children at Risk of WFCL) - Pilot Actions Aimed at Prevention,

Withdrawal, Rehabilitation and Reintegration of (Ex) Child- Labourers into Society

- Action Programme Summary Outline

8. AP: Capacity building of Labour Inspection for its participation in the Child Labour Monitoring System in Donetsk and Kherson oblasts

- Action Programme Summary Outline
- Workplan

9. Rapid Assessment Survey on the Use of Child Labour in Six “Sectors” of the Informal Economy/Unconditional Work in Ukraine

- Terms of Reference
- Budget
- Timeframe

10. Child Labour Unit (CLU), Ministry of Labour and Social Policy of Ukraine (within the Programme: Enhancing the Capacity of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy in combating the Worst Forms of Child Labour, including trafficking in trafficking)

- Terms of Reference
- CLU-related correspondence between ILO and Labour Inspection
- CLU Head’s Service Agreement
- CLU Head’s CV
- Minute on selection and recruitment for the post Head of the Child Labour Unit

11. Mini-programme: Raising awareness on child labour through a competition in drawings, photos and creative writing.

- Mini-programme outline
- Final Report

12. Mini-programme: Strengthening the capacity of the State Labour Inspectorate to combat unconditional hidden child labour.

- Mini-programme outline
- Final Report

13. Mini-programme: Awareness raising for Members of Parliament

- Mini-programme outline

14. Mini-programme: Expert Review of the social assistance for trafficked children in Ukraine

- Mini-programme outline
- Final Report
- PowerPoint Presentation

15. Mini-programme: TOT for youth leaders of Ukraine on improving understanding of CL issues

- Mini-programme outline
- Final Report

16. Mini-programme: Strengthening the capacity of the Trade Unions of Ukraine to combat the WFCL

- Mini-programme outline

- Final Report
17. Mini-programme: World Day Against Child Labour in Mining.
 - Mini-programme outline
 - Final Report
 18. Baseline Survey on the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Four Selected Regions in Ukraine.
 - Terms of Reference
 - Draft Report
 19. Mini-programme: TOT Workshop for Teachers on SCREAM Methodology.
 - Terms of Reference
 - Final Report
 20. Translation/Adaptation of “Supporting Children’s Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media” SCREAM.
 - Terms of Reference
 21. Study on the current Ukrainian legal framework for child labour and recommendations on the national legislation harmonization with relevant international standards.
 - Terms of Reference
 - Study Report
 22. Training of Broad Based Alliance of stakeholders against WFCL including trafficking in two IPEC targeted oblasts in Ukraine.
 - Terms of Reference
 - Final report
 23. IPEC-Ukraine Technical Progress Reports.
 - TPR-September 2005
 - TPR-March 2006
 24. Evaluation Reports.
 - Mid-Term Evaluation Report, June 2004
 - Self-evaluation report
 25. List of IPEC programmes in Ukraine (by 2004).
 26. Action Programmes under the Country Programme – Ukraine (1 February 2004 – 31 August 2006).
 27. ILO-IPEC Programme Operations Manual.
 28. ILO-IPEC Time-Bound Programme: Manual for Action Planning.
 29. ILO-IPEC-Ukraine Publications:
 - CLU information leaflet
 - Labour Inspectors Manual
 - ILO Conventions

- ILO-IPEC: goal and activities in Ukraine
- ILO-IPEC: projects, objectives and partners

30. Child Labour in Ukraine: Statistical Bulletin. ILO-IPEC and State Statistics Committee of Ukraine, Kyiv, 2001.

31. Concept on Prevention and Elimination of WFCL approved by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine Resolution #364-p from June 16, 2003.

32. Plan of Actions on implementation of the Concept on Prevention and Elimination of WFCL (364-2003-p) approved by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine Resolution #648-p from October 29, 2003.

33. Information on the status of Action Plan on implementation of the Concept on Prevention and Elimination of WFCL for 2005 (Ministry of Family, Youth and Sport).

34. Resolution of the Head of Kherson Oblast State Administration on Coordination of Activities to eliminate WFCL #252 from March 16, 2006.

Annex 4: National Consultation Workshop Participants' Input

National Consultation Workshop April 3rd 2006

IPEC Programme in Ukraine - key-achievements and future perspectives

Key Achievements

1. National level: IPEC and partners (Government, NGOs, social partners)

- Commitment of the Government and national stakeholders to eradicate the WFCL, which is evidenced through the approval in 2003 of the Concept on Prevention and Combating WFCL and the Plan of Action to Eradicate the WFCL in Ukraine.
- Ownership of the national partners. (Initiative of Labour Inspection to create an Inter-Agency Task Force to combat WFCL.)
- Improvement of the national legislation, i.e. Law on Childhood Protection was amended in 2005
- Multi-disciplinary approach and response to the problem (tripartite + cooperation)
- CLMS is mainstreamed into the Draft National Action Plan to implement CRC for 2006 – 2015
- Close cooperation of the public institutions and NGOs active in the field of child rights protection
- The awareness on the issue has been raised. A documentary on the WFCL and ways to combat it is an important tool to attract attention of the officials as well as public at large to the issue.
- Knowledge base on CL is set up through a number of qualitative researches.
- Involvement of Labour Inspection and State Employment Service into the CLMS
- InterAgency cooperation with IOM, OSCE and UNICEF

2. Local level

- The IPEC Programme has successfully implemented its activities in the pilot regions of Vinnitca, Kyiv, Donetsk and Kherson in 2002-2003. As a result, 1200 working boys and girls were withdrawn from CL and provided with rehabilitation/educational/vocational services as per their needs.
- Several children withdrawn during CP Phase 1 now act as peer educators for children – direct beneficiaries of the ILO-IPEC APs. They applied knowledge gained in the CP Phase 1 and mainstreamed it into the activities of the youth centres.
- Models of rehabilitation were designed and tested during CP Phase 1.
- Methodology on identification and rehabilitation of children drafted. All methodological tools are based on child-centred approaches.
- Volunteers, involved in the implementation of the Action Programme, received professional trainings and manuals.
- Personnel/staff trained and sensitized on CL issues

- The capacities of the Public Employment Service are being used in the implementation of the Action Programmes.
- Multidisciplinary groups (LACs) to combat WFCL established.
- The awareness on the issue has been raised. A documentary on the WFCL and ways to combat it is an important tool to attract attention of the officials as well as public at large to the issue.
- Knowledge base on CL is set up through a number of qualitative researches.

Future plans/perspectives

- Child Labour Monitoring System is to be successfully tested and mainstreamed into the national legislature.
- Replication of the mechanisms to combat WFCL tested in the pilot regions.
- Scale-up activities for the CLMS through IPEC Time-Bound Programme?.
- Sharing of the existing experience and good practices collected while implementing IPEC activities in PROTECT CEE member states
- Drafting of the National Plan of Actions to Eradicate the WFCL in Ukraine with sufficient state allocations
- Set up of the Inter-Agency Task Force to combat WFCL (based at the Cabinet of Ministers)
- Strengthening of the social dialogue in issues related to WFCL.
- Design of an integrated information database of children at “risk” in Ukraine.
- More “aggressive” information campaigns to be designed and launched. Involvement of children in the information campaigns is crucial.
- Capacities of the existing rehabilitation centres for children to be enhanced.
- The notion of children at “risk” is to be more broadly defined thus including more categories of children.
- Work with parents is needed. The training manuals are to be produced for parents and LACs members.
- Professionals who work with children trained under the Actions Programmes are to act as trainers for their counterparts in other regions of Ukraine.
- The regular work of LACs is to be formalized in the future after the current APs are finished.
- Volunteers (students mainly) are to be involved into implementation of the APs.
- The status of labour inspectors is to be strengthened; their mandate is to be broadened.
- All localities (rayons levels) are to be involved in the implementation of the APs to exchange experience in combating WFCL.



**International Programme on the Elimination of Child
Labour
ILO/IPEC**

<p>Final Version March 2006</p>

ANNEX 1
Terms of Reference
For
Final Evaluation
of

*National Programme for the Prevention and
Elimination of Worst Forms of Child Labour in Ukraine*

ILO TC Project number:	UKR/01/P50/USA
ILO Project code:	P340001443050
IRIS Code:	12083
Country:	Ukraine
Starting date:	March 2001
Ending dates:	June 2006 (project extensions)
Project location:	Ukraine
Project language:	English
Executing agency:	ILO-IPEC
Financing agency:	US Department of Labor
Donor contribution:	US\$ 1,127,980

I. Background and Justification

According to the Constitution of Ukraine, child labour in public production has been and remains formally prohibited. However, it always existed, often as an integral part of the educational system and was considered valuable experience in preparing children for future life. It was mainly of a non-lucrative character and was limited to occupational training at schools and/or factories, apprenticeship, engagement in household, subsidiary economy, agriculture work, in particular in summer labour camps during school holidays. The particularity of child labour under the Soviet system was such that, on the one hand, it was a legally recognized part of the educational system. On the other hand, it was compulsory and non-remunerated work, hazardous in certain cases for example, in agriculture sector. It has the form of training or apprenticeship but was used in fact for the purposes of economic production on a large-scale national level. Under the conditions of a relatively stable planned production on a large-scale national level. Under the conditions of a relatively stable planned Soviet economy, child labour did not have such a destructive impact on children because it was surveyed by national education bodies and was considered to be rather a means of education and not that of subsistence. The situation changed drastically after the economic collapse in the country. Under these crises conditions, child labour as a large scale social and economic problem acquired new and unexpected dimensions. The transformation of the economic structure brought to life a large segment of the shadow economy in which child labour is widely used. Much of the child labour is to be found in the informal sector. Petty commerce appears to be the most common occupation in which street children are engaged. Approximately one third of those working are engaged in selling in the streets or markets. The number of children working under the market conditions started to increase rapidly. Money became the main reason and motivation for work. General social disorder rendered children unprotected, particularly in relation to the employer. Children became an object of manipulation and exploitation under the conditions of practical absence of legal and administrative control and regulations. Prevalent and harmful child labour is a new phenomenon which has recently emerged in the Ukrainian society.

There are several explanations for the new phenomenon. The situation has been exacerbated by the effects of the economic and political transition through its negative impact on the ability of adult family members to support the household. Second, work is traditionally considered to be educational rather than harmful to children. As a result, because short-term material well-being depends not on education but on the ability and willingness to provide economic activities or perform income-generating work, education is seen as less important than employment. After the decline of communism the national educational curriculum was reformed as far as the communist ideology related disciplines were concerned. However, the current curriculum is not relevant to student needs and, therefore, corresponding curriculum modification is one of the objectives of this country programme.

The unique and complex nature of the phenomenon of child labour in Ukraine required an integrated approach in order to achieve a broad and sustainable impact. At the time, it was important to test interventions for the prevention of child labour, with emphasis on the withdrawal and rehabilitation of children involved in such activities. This was to be achieved by using the experience gained in other countries to provide alternatives for working children. In order to maximize IPEC's impact, direct action programmes were developed in the context of the country programme in the selected regions, targeting the worst forms of child labour - including child prostitution, working street children and children employed in rural areas

The Memorandum of Understanding between the International Labour Organization (ILO), represented by the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC), and the Ukrainian Government was signed in June of 2002. This document has set up a foundation for cooperation between the Government of Ukraine and the ILO with the goal to prevent and

progressively eliminate child labour in Ukraine, as well as to increase awareness at the national level of the consequential problems and solutions pertaining to the issue of child labour

The basic ILO conventions concerning child labour issues have been ratified by Ukraine, which include the ILO Convention 138 on the Minimum Age for Employment, ratified in March 1999 and the ILO Convention No. 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour - in October 2000. These conventions, with accompanying recommendations, provide a formidable legal framework for combating child labour

The overall aim for the work of IPEC in Ukraine has been established as assisting the country to

- (i) Promote the policy development initiatives;
- (ii) Prevent the increase of child labour;
- (iii) Build the capacity of concerned governmental and non-governmental agencies;
- (iv) Conduct qualitative research to assess the extent and character of the forms of child labour targeted by this program;
- (v) Implement direct action activities; and
- (vi) Raise public awareness in the country about child labour.

In 2004 the project was revised and extended until June 2006. The project continued the strategy as spelled out in the project document but revised them to take into account some specific recommendations from the mid-term evaluation of March 2003.

The recommendations of the mid-term evaluation were:

- The complexity of a tracking and monitoring system should not be underestimated and the design should always be adjusted to the local available infrastructure and be designed with an eye to sustainability and replicability.
- Training is only one element of capacity building. More attention needs to be paid on measuring the effect of training and providing follow-up activities when required.
- National workshops offer a good opportunity to create awareness and raise interest but it is necessary to offer thereafter more assistance to those that have shown interest and capacity to take concrete action.
- Educational reforms aiming to improve the educational system on a whole and to achieve a high school attendance rate are best placed to prevent child labour as well as to mainstream and sustain action against child labour. Additional Direct Action Programmes with a view to support this strategic consideration would allow for better impact measuring and local educational authorities would be persuaded to internalize child labour into educational reforms.

The project revision modified and added the following objectives (in bold) to the country programme (The development objective and objectives one and two are as the original project document):

Development Objective

The programme will contribute to the prevention and progressive elimination of CL in Ukraine, focusing on the worst forms of CL as defined in ILO Convention on the Worst Forms of CL (No. 182)

Immediate Objective 1: After three months the institutional framework for the programme will be put in place and at the end of the programme monitoring mechanisms will be established and tracking system set up and operational.

Immediate Objective 2: At the end of the programme, capacity of government of Ukraine will be strengthened to enforce CL policies by means of (i) developing a National Policy and Plan of Action based on the National Report on CL drafted by the Ukrainian Institute of Social Research in June 2000; (ii) reviewing the national legislation and make suggestions to harmonize the legal framework for CL with international standards; (iii) strengthening the capacity of training institutions.

Immediate Objective 3: (revised) At the end of the programme, parents, community leaders, employers' organizations representatives have greater awareness and better understanding of Child Labour issues.

Immediate Objective 4: (revised) At the end of the project, direct action programmes aimed at the prevention, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of child labourers from specific sectors into society will have been implemented, documented and lessons learnt will have been shared with the Government of Ukraine and ILO partners.

Immediate Objective 5: (new) At the end of the project, knowledge base of the national stakeholders on child labour issues will have been improved through the research on the use of child labour in the informal economy. The research will be carried out in at least six sectors and supervised by an Editing Board, recruited based on recommendation on the National Steering Committee.

Immediate Objective 6: (new) At the end of the programme, an integrated model of Child Labour Monitoring System has been tested in two different oblasts and is presented for replication to the Government, to social partners and relevant stakeholders.

In Ukraine, the present country programme works closely with the Ukraine component of the sub-regional project Combating Trafficking of children for labour and sexual exploitation in the Balkans and Ukraine (PROTECT CEE project).

Evaluation Background:

The current Terms of Reference for the evaluation is prepared based on a consultative process with key stakeholders who have been asked to provide inputs on the purpose, questions to address and methodology of the evaluation.

It has been decided to jointly schedule the field visits of the Ukraine component of the sub-regional project and the final evaluation of the Ukraine Country Programme. This was decided based on the fact that the two projects share many of the same project partners, geographic regions and implementing agencies. The focal persons in the Ministry of Labour are the same for both projects and many of the activities under the two projects support both projects (example: legislative reviews), furthermore the activities are designed to compliment each other and the sub-regional PROTECT project is contributing to the CP Ukraine project. Methodologically a joint scheduling of the evaluations would be an effective and important way to see the contribution of the projects to each other and an effective way to enter into discussion and interviews with the project partners. It was also seen as a way to simplify the evaluation process for the Ukraine project partners who would not need to be interviewed twice within a very short time span.

The present Terms of Reference for the Ukraine country programme final evaluation is an annex to the Terms of Reference of the PROTECT CEE evaluation.

II. Scope and Purpose

Scope:

The scope of the evaluation includes all project activities including Action Programmes. The evaluation should look at the project as a whole and address issues of project design, implementation, lessons learned, replicability and recommendations for the future of the programme. The evaluation should further look into planning and feasibility of future activities, especially the possibility of a Time-Bound Programme in Ukraine.

Purpose:

The purpose of the present evaluation should be to assess whether the objectives of the project were achieved by comparing the intended outputs with the actual outputs. The evaluation should assess the overall impact of the project or progress towards it at different levels such as at policy level, beneficiaries level, community level and household level. The evaluation should try to assess the effectiveness of the project operation/implementation and management both at the implementing agency level and at IPEC level. It should analyze strategies and models of intervention used, document lessons learned and potential good practices, and provide recommendations on how to integrate these into planning processes and implementation of future IPEC activities in the project countries. A particular focus should be to identify elements of effective models of intervention.

III. Suggested Aspects to be Addressed

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency** and **sustainability** as defined in the *ILO Guidelines for the Preparation of Independent Evaluations of ILO Programmes and Projects* and for gender concerns see: *ILO Guidelines for the Integration of Gender Issues into the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmes and Projects, January 1995*.

The following are the broad suggested aspects that can be identified at this point for the evaluation to address. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation team in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with DED. The evaluation instrument prepared by the evaluation team will indicate further selected specific aspects to be addressed.

Design

- Assess the relevance of the project design, did it address major child labour issues in Ukraine? How well did the project design take into account local efforts already underway to address child labour and existing capacity to address the issues?
- Assess whether the beneficiaries were clearly identified (i.e. sub-groups, age, socio-economic status, etc. 'poor' or 'women' is not a homogenous group,) determine if more details are needed to better target interventions.
- Assess whether the problems and needs were adequately analysed. Determine whether the needs, constraints, resources and access to project services of the different beneficiaries were clearly identified taking gender issues into concern.
- Examine the appropriateness of the indicators and whether they are 'measurable'
- To what extent were external factors identified and assumptions identified at the time of design?
- Were the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical?
- Assess the design of the action programmes, its link to the overall project and assess the community participation during the formulation phase

Relevance of Strategy

- How does the strategy (capacity building on Labour Inspection to participate in Child Labour Monitoring System, job counseling and vocational training provision to working children, referral system, peer education legal and policy advice to parents of working children, knowledge management) fit within national development, education and anti-poverty efforts, existing policies and programmes on child labour and interventions carried out by other organizations?
- Is the strategy still relevant to the context of child labour in Ukraine?
- Were alternative strategies considered or implemented during the life of the programme?

- Were explicit strategies developed in coordination with the PROTECT CEE project?

Process of Implementation of the programme

- How closely has the project adhered to the workplan at the country? How effective are local management structures (e.g. National Steering Committees etc.) of the project? Assess the participation of different relevant actors (e.g. Ministry of Labour, trade unions, employers' organizations, law enforcement, judiciary, etc.) How are these structures participating in project implementation? How is this participation contributing to progress toward the objectives of the project?
- How efficient is the process by which the Action Programmes proposals are reviewed and approved. Assess process of allocating resources to each country.
- Assess the beneficiary selection process. How are participants chosen? Are project activities reaching the target population?
- How efficient does the project seem to be in terms of resources allocated as compared to project impact? In general, do results being achieved appear to justify costs being incurred?
- How effectively is the project in leveraging resources (e.g. by collaborating with non-IPEC initiatives and programmes launched during its life) What process is being undertaken by the project to identify and cooperate with other initiatives and organizations?
- Are internationally recognized methodological tools being shared sufficiently and used within IPEC and amongst IPEC partners? Were the tools adapted to the national context?

Performance and Achievements

- Is the project making sufficient progress toward reaching its immediate objectives? Is the expected number of beneficiaries being reached in each country? Are outputs being delivered on a timely basis and of appropriate quality?
- How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners, including the government, to develop effective action against child labour been enhanced as a result of the project activities?
- How effective are action programmes to date, and how much are they contributing to the project meeting its immediate objectives?
- Assess the CLMS in place, assess the relevance and usefulness to project partners and government officials. Is it likely to be sustained after the project ends? Is the CLMS relevant to child victims of trafficking? Recommendation on how to scale up the current pilot micro approach to the national level.
- How effective is the project in raising awareness about child labour and in promoting social mobilization to address this issue?
- Is the work of IPEC sufficiently recognized and visible at national level?
- Assess the level of government involvement to and support for the project
- Identify unexpected and multiplier effects of the project.
- To what extent are synergies exploited and economies of scale created?
- Assess what effect the regional based approach of the project had on the project as whole versus implementing the components on an individual country by country approach.
- To what extent are factors outside the control of the project management affecting project implementation and attainment of objectives/goals?
- Did the project coordinate activities with ILO-IPEC's PROTECT CEE project in the Balkans and Ukraine? Were these projects complementary?
- Are the learning coalitions set up at national level functioning properly? What actions could be taken to improve their efficiency?

Sustainability

- How effective has the project been to date in promoting local ownership of the project and promoting long-term sustainability? Has the idea of a phase-out strategy for the project been clearly articulated and progress made toward this goal?
- What are the long-term commitment, and the technical and financial capacity of local/national/regional/ institutions to continue delivering services to the beneficiary group once the project ends?

Special Aspects to be Addressed

- Assess which of the programme interventions seem to be effective and replicable. Are they likely to be replicated and scaled up at national level?
- Assess the extent the project took advantage and exploited opportunities of learning from other projects including processes.
- Assess how the project could improve children's involvement in activities carried out by the project.

IV. Expected Outputs of the Evaluation

The following are the expected outputs:

- A desk review by the national consultant
- An evaluation instrument prepared by the evaluation team
- Field visits in Ukraine
- Stakeholder workshops facilitated by the evaluator including participation from project staff and ILO staff . A programme for the workshop and a briefing note.
- Draft evaluation report including information from background report, stakeholder workshop proceedings and findings from field visits by evaluation team
- Final Report including:
 - ✓ Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
 - ✓ Clearly identified findings
 - ✓ Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations
 - ✓ Lessons learned
 - ✓ Potential good practices and effective models of intervention.
 - ✓ Appropriate Annexes including present TORs
 - ✓ Standard evaluation instrument matrix

The total length of the report should be a maximum of 30 pages for main report, excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the countries evaluated. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low. Please include appropriate page numbering and paragraph numbering in the report.

All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided both in paper copy and in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO-IPEC. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

The final report will be circulated to key stakeholders (those participants present at stakeholder evaluation workshop will be considered key stakeholders) for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED) of ILO/IPEC Geneva and provided to the team leader. In preparing the final report the team leader should consider these comments, incorporate as appropriate and provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated.

V. Evaluation Methodology

The following is the proposed evaluation methodology. While the evaluation team leader can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by DED provided that the research and analysis suggests changes and provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality.

The evaluation team will be asked to use the **standard evaluation instruments** that ILO/IPEC has developed for documenting and analyzing achievements of the projects and contributions of the Action Programmes to the project. Further the evaluation team will need to take into consideration specific methodological concerns in relation to interviews with Roma beneficiary boys and girls and their parents. The use of visual graphs and diagrams to relate ideas and concepts is encouraged.

The evaluation will be carried out using a desk review, field visits in Ukraine, a workshop with project staff and partners and project management. Field visits include consultations with boys and girls and their parents, community leaders, government representatives, employer and workers' groups as appropriate. There will be a national workshop with project management and key stakeholders. The national workshop will be a joint workshop with the PROTECT CEE Ukraine component.

The identified team leader of the PROTECT CEE project will also be the team leader of the CP Ukraine project. For the final evaluation of the CP Ukraine project, a national consultant will be recruited to prepare a background report and undertake field visits in the Ukraine with the team leader. The field visits will be of a longer duration in the Ukraine than in the other PROTECT CEE project countries to ensure that the full range of partners for both projects can be consulted.

The national consultant will be responsible for drafting the draft report for CP Ukraine final evaluation. The team leader will incorporate the draft report into the annex of the PROTECT CEE project evaluation as appropriate.

The evaluation team will interview the donor representatives, IPEC HQ, and ILO/IPEC regional persons through a conference call early in the evaluation process, preferably during the desk review phase.

Composition of the evaluation team:

The **evaluation team** will consist of **one team leader as identified in the context of the PROTECT CEE project and one evaluation team member (national consultant).**

The background of the team leader:

- ✓ Relevant background in social and/or economic development
- ✓ Experience in working with Roma people and on Roma issues or other marginalized groups
- ✓ Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with local development projects.
- ✓ Experience in evaluations in the UN system, preferably as team leader

- ✓ Relevant regional experience preferably prior working experience in all project countries
- ✓ Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework is highly appreciated.
- ✓ Familiarity with situation of vulnerable groups of children is highly appreciated
- ✓ Experience in the area of education and legal issues would also be appreciated
- ✓ Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience
- ✓ Fluency in English
- ✓ Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings

The appointment of the consultant will be approved according to established procedures

*The profile of the **national consultant (evaluation team member)** should include:*

- ✓ Experience in evaluation of development projects, in particular with local development projects.
- ✓ Relevant background in social and/or economic development
- ✓ Experience in the area of capacity building and children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework in Ukraine would be highly appreciated
- ✓ Experience working in their country
- ✓ Fluency in English
- ✓ Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings

The **evaluation team leader** and **evaluation team member** will separately undertake a desk review prior to the evaluation field visits, the evaluation team will undertake field visits of a 9-day duration including a one day stakeholder workshop and jointly facilitate the workshop.

The **national consultant** will be responsible for drafting the evaluation report of the Country Programme Ukraine. The national consultant will submit the draft report to the team leader who will incorporate the report in the PROTECT CEE evaluation.

Upon feedback from stakeholders to the draft report, the evaluation **team leader** will further be responsible for finalizing the report incorporating any comments deemed appropriate.

The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the IPEC-DED section and with the logistical support of the project offices and project management in Bucharest and in Kiev. DED will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting it to the team leader.

Timetable and Workshop schedule:

The team leader will be engaged for 9 day of field visits and 7 days for incorporating the draft report and finalizing the report. The national consultant will be engaged for a period of 20 working days which covers the desk review, field visits, drafting the report and providing support in finalizing the report to the team leader.

Phases	Tasks	Dates	Responsible Person
I: Desk Review	Desk review of relevant project documents	March 20-24	National Consultant ¹¹
	Ukraine: Visit APs, govt, workshop with staff/partners including CP Ukraine component	March 27-April 5	Evaluation team
III: Draft Report	National consultant drafts CP Ukraine evaluation report	April 6-12 5 days	National Consultant
	Draft report incorporated into PROTECT CEE evaluation report	April 13-14 2 days	Team leader
IV: Stakeholders comments	Draft report ¹² circulated by DED to all key stakeholders for their comments. Comments consolidated and send to team leader for finalizing the report	April 14-May 5 Three weeks	DED
V: Final report	Team leader finalizes the evaluation report for PROTECT CEE and CP Ukraine annex taking into consideration the consolidated comments	One week	Team leader
		1 day support	National consultant

Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings

Available at HQ and to be supplied by DED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • DED Guidelines and ILO guidelines
Available in project office and to be supplied by project management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports/Status reports • Technical and financial report of partner agencies • Other studies and research undertaken • Action Programme Summary Outlines Project files • National workshop proceedings or summaries • Country reports on activities to date • Good practices and documentation of experience

Consultations with:

- Project management and staff
- ILO and IPEC HQ, regional staff
- Partner agencies
- Relevant Government Ministries
- Donor via telephone
- Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups
- Boys and Girls
- Community members
- Parents of boys and girls
- Teachers, government representatives, legal authorities etc as identified by evaluation team
- Others as identified by the project teams

¹¹ Team leader to conduct desk review in context of PROTECT CEE evaluation, see TORs of PROTECT CEE for further details

¹² Draft report to be available for use in the national stakeholder workshops in preparation of Ph. III of PROTECT CEE project in Balkans and Ukraine

Final Report Submission Procedure

For independent evaluations, the following procedure is used:

- The **team leader** will submit a draft report of PROTECT CEE project with CP Ukraine as annex to **IPEC DED in Geneva**
- **IPEC DED** will forward a copy to **key stakeholders** for comments on factual issues and for clarifications
- **IPEC DED** will consolidate the comments and send these to the **evaluation team leader** by date agreed between DED and the evaluation team leader or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders.
- The final report is submitted to IPEC DED who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

VI. Resources and Management

Resources:

The resources required for this evaluation are:

For evaluation team leader:

- Fees for an international consultant for 16 work days
- Travel lump sum¹³ for travel to Ukraine and local DSA in each project location as appropriate.

For national consultant:

- Fees for national consultant for 20 work days
- DSA in project locations outside of Kiev as appropriate and in line with ILO regulations and rules.

For Interpreter:

- Fees for an interpreter for 8 work days
- DSA in project locations outside of Kiev as appropriate and in line with ILO regulations and rules

For the evaluation exercise as a whole:

- Fees for local travel in-country
- Stakeholder workshop expenditures
- Any other miscellaneous costs (translation, printing, etc)

A separate budget is available.

Management:

The national consultant for Ukraine will work under the supervision of the team leader on technical and methodological issues. The team leader and evaluation team member will report to IPEC DED in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with DED should issues arise. IPEC project officials in Bucharest and in Kiev will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

¹³ Travel lump sum given directly to the consultant includes only international airfare. All local travel expenses such as car hire, train tickets etc. are to be paid directly by the project in Ukraine.

As per TPR September 2005

Completed Action Programmes funded under UKR 01/50P/USA						
Serial No.	Action Programme number (P340.92.235.051 or P340.02.900.050 BL21Pos 003)	Title of AP and name of Implementing Agency	Amount in local currency UAH	Number of monitoring visits undertaken	Start date	Completion date
1.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2002- 45087	Enhancing the capacity of the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy (MLSP) and the State Committee on Family and Youth Affairs (SCFY) ¹⁴ to develop and enforce child labor policies as well as monitor and further analyze the situation and trends of child labor in Ukraine IA: Department of Surveillance of Labour Legislation Observance, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy	95,400	3	April 2002	April 2003
2.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2002-45309 BL21 Pos 005	Direct Action program "A minimum of 600 working children from the rural areas in the selected regions of Ukraine withdrawn from work, enrolled into schools and trained through individual education packages, vocational training and counselling" IA: Charity Fund "Intellectual'na Perspectyva"	559,623	13	December 15, 2002	January 1, 2004
3.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2002-45689 BL21 Pos 011	Direct Action program "A minimum of 500 working street children in the selected cities of Ukraine withdrawn from work and rehabilitated through a package of education counselling and vocational training" IA: "Donetsk Youth Debate Center"	506,190	12	December 20, 2002	January 1, 2004
4.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2002-45312 BL21 Pos 004	Direct Action program "At least 100 children engaged in prostitution (boys and girls under 18) withdrawn from work, rehabilitated and trained through counselling, special training programs and health services" IA: Kherson NGO "Uspishna Zhinka"	293,097	8	December 15, 2002	January 1, 2004

³This is the former State Committee on Youth Affairs, Sport and Tourism that has been re-organized and renamed in December 2001; from February 2004 this is the Ministry of Family, Children and Youth Affairs.

5.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2002- 45053	Action Programme” A Strategy and a package of awareness raising activities in selected Ukrainian villages designed and implemented aiming at children psycho-physiological needs, the dangers of employment at an early age, and legal provisions on the protection of children” IA: Vinnitsa NGO “Podilsky Center of Human Rights Protection”	95,400	4	May 1, 2002	November 30, 2002
6.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2002- 85249	Mini-Program “ Strengthening the capacity of the Trade Unions of Ukraine to combat the Worst forms of Child labor IA: The Academy of Labour and Social Relations, Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine	16,525	1	March 15,2002	April 15,2002
7.	P 340. 01.443.050 EPA # 2003 – 45323 BL 21 Pos 012	Mini-program “Raising awareness on child labour through a competition in drawings, photos and creative writing” IA: “The Ukrainian Center on Practical Psychology and Social Work ” under the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine	26,352	2	June 12, 2003	August, 31 2003
8.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2003 – 46653 Bl 21 Pos 013	Mini-program “Strengthening capacity of the State Labor Inspectorate to combat unconditional hidden child labor” IA: “State Department on Surveillance on Labor Legislation Observance, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy”	26,650	1	August 15, 2003	August 28, 2003
9.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2002- 45153 BL 21 Pos 010	Mini program “TOT for youth leaders of Ukraine on improving their understanding of CL issues” IA: “Information Methodic Debate Center” (co-financed by UNICEF)	5,277	0	June 24, 2002	August 10, 2002
10.	P 340 01 443 050 EPA # 2001-81749 EPA # 2002-81745	Baseline survey on the worst forms of child labor in four selected regions in Ukraine (a qualitative research on CL) External Consultant (EC) Yuriy Privalov, “The Center of Social Expertise and Prognosis, National Academy of Sciences, Ukraine”	79,950	4	December 2001	March 2002

11.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2002-84 661	Mini-Program 'Study on the current Ukrainian legal framework for child labor and recommendations on the national legislation harmonization with relevant international standards' EC- Mr. Viktor Mouraviev	26,650	0	February 15, 2002	May 30, 2002
12.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA #46643	MP "Review of the social assistance for trafficked children in Ukraine " IA: International Women's Right Center "LaStrada"	8,581	0	15 May 2004	15 June 2004
13.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA #2004-04572	Training of Broad Based Alliance of stakeholders against WFCL including trafficking in two IPEC targeted oblasts	25,807	2	1 July, 2004	31 August 2004
14.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2005-69731200	MP "World Day Against Child Labour in Mining" IA: Independent Trade Unions of Miners in Ukraine	15,865	0	01 June 2005	31 July 2005
Pipeline and Ongoing Action Programmes						
15.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA# 2005-90204/001 going EPA # 2005-10749 Ongoing	"Enhancing the capacity of the MLSP in combating WFCL, including trafficking in Children" (TOR for Child Labour Unit) External Collaborator	15,270.48	0	1 March 2005	31 August 2006
16.	P 340.01.443.050 EPA # 2005-69731201 Ongoing	MP "Awareness raising for Members of Parliament" IA: Women's Consortium	5,550	0	September 2005	November 2005
17.	INT/00/70/USA (USDOL Residual Funds) EPA# 2005-69732705 Ongoing	TOR Documentary on WFCL in Ukraine External Collaborator	50,100	0	July 2005	September 2005
18.	P 340.01.443.050 Pipeline	Action Program "Rapid Assessment Survey on the Use of Child Labour in Six Sectors of the Informal Economy in Ukraine" External Collaborator	301,200	0	September 2005	April 2006

19.	P 340.01.443.050 Pipeline	Action Program “Capacity building of Labour Inspection for its participation in the Child Labour Monitoring System in Donetsk and Kherson oblasts” IA: Charity Fund “Intellectual’na Perspectyva”	461,885	0	October 2005	June 2006
-----	------------------------------	--	---------	---	--------------	-----------

Planned Action Programmes as of September 2005

Proposed draft title or purpose	Total Allocation	Planned dates for submission for approval to HQ
Awareness raising programmes including media training (Output 3.1 and Output 3.2)	USD 22,774	November 2005
TOT on SCREAM methodology to be presented for teachers from institutes of professional development and practical psychologists attached to schools which are to act as future trainers for SCREAM methodology	USD 8,000	September 2005
<p>Direct action programmes aimed at the prevention, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of child labourers from specific sectors in Donetsk and Kherson regions into society (Output 4.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct Action Programme: Targeting Worst Forms of Child Labour (Children Working in Mines, Street Working Children, Institutionalized Children at Risk of WFCL) - Pilot Actions Aimed at Prevention, Withdrawal, Rehabilitation and Reintegration of (Ex)Child- Labourers into Society (Donetsk region). • Direct Action Programme: Targeting Worst Forms of Child Labour (children involved in Agriculture, Sexual Exploitation, Institutionalized Children at Risk of WFCL) - Pilot Actions Aimed at Prevention, Withdrawal, Rehabilitation and Reintegration of (Ex)Child- Labourers into Society (Kherson region). 	<p>USD 90,452</p> <p>USD 50,000</p>	September 2005
Translation into English of the ten existing publications on the "good practices" in Ukrainian, printing and dissemination (Output 5.2)	USD 5,000	November 2005
Translation into Ukrainian of SCREAM package	USD 5,000	September 2005